DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 744 UD 010 861

AUTHOR	McKelvey, Troy V.
TITLE	Problems Incident to Urban School Desegregation: An Institute for School Administrators of the Buffalo and Niagara Falls Public Schools. Interim Report Draft.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Dept. of Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Apr 69
GRANT	OEG-0-8-000369-4411
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy, Administrative Problems, *Administrator Attitudes, Bus Transportation, Changing Attitudes, *Institutes (Training Programs), *Integration Methods, Integration Plans, School Community Relationship, *School Integration, Sensitivity Training, Summer Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Civil Rights Act of 1964, New York, Title IV Programs

ABSTRACT

An Institute funded under Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was held during 1968-69 in order to concentrate on the attitudes of the administrative leadership of the schools involved in a busing program. The purpose of the Institute was to initiate and evaluate action programs to facilitate the implementation of the School System's desegregation policies. It was planned around the perceived needs of the administrative staff of the participating school districts. The two problem areas most frequently identified by participants were: (1) school-community relations and (2) teachers and staffing. The Institute was divided into three parts: the first was a comprehensive two-week workshop for 20 participants in the summer of 1968; the second was a comprehensive four-day workshop held in November, 1968 that was designed to familiarize new participants with the experiences of the summer workshop; and, the third consisted of monthly workshops designed to build upon the ideas of the comprehensive workshops and to move toward a working plan for each school. [Appendix B (pp. 34-36), a Summer Workshop Evaluation Form, is missing from this document.] (Authors/JM)

ED 045744

INTERIM REPORT DRAFT

TITLE: PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO URBAN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

An institute for school administrators of the
Buffalo and Niagara Falls Public Schools

AUTHOR OF REPORT: Troy V. McKelvey

CONTRACT NUMBER: (OEG-0-8-000369-4411)
Public Law 88-352. Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

DIRECTOR: Troy V. McKelvey, Ed. D.
Assistant Professor of Education
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

SUBMITTED THROUGH: The Research Foundation of the
State University of New York
Albany, New York

SUBMITTED BY: The Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

UD010861

The Institute reported herein was submitted by a contract from the
United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

DATE SUBMITTED: April 15, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Director of the Institute on Problems Incident to Urban School Desegregation is grateful to many persons and organizations which have contributed to the success of the Institute.

The chief financial support which permitted an idea to be transformed into reality was provided by the United States Government under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. The Summer Session (1968) and regular academic session (1968-69) of the State University of New York at Buffalo provided the meeting facilities for the entire workshop.

Donald R. Gardner coordinated the Institute organization. Pamela Cook coordinated all the secretarial and clerical tasks involved in planning and conducting the Institute and in preparing the necessary reports.

The action of the Buffalo and Niagara Public School Districts to allow participants to be released early to attend the monthly workshops is appreciated. A special word of thanks is in order to Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent, Buffalo Public Schools; Donald Laing, Director of Integration, Buffalo Public Schools; and Weldon Oliver, Superintendent, Niagara Falls Public Schools, for their encouragement and contributions to the importance of the total Institute.

The participants are to be commended for the wholesome attitude with which they approached their tasks. In the last analysis, it was the response of the participants which permitted the Institute objectives to be realized.

Buffalo, New York

April 15, 1969

Troy V. McKelvey, Director
Institute on Problems Incident
to Urban School Desegregation

CONTENTS

SECTION I - An Overview 1

Introduction 2

Problem Identification 2

Planning 3

Procedures 3

The Summer Workshop - Part I 4

The November Workshop - Part II 6

The Monthly Workshops - Part III 7

SECTION II - The Workshops in Detail 8

Part I - The Summer Workshop 9

Part II - The November Workshops 12

Part III - The Monthly Workshops 19

September 20

October 22

January 25

February 27

BUDGET CHANGES AND TRANSFERS 30

APPENDICES

Appendix A Institute Participants 32

Appendix B Summer Workshop Evaluation Form 34

Appendix C Summer Workshop Evaluation 37

Appendix D November Workshop Evaluation Form 42

Appendix E November Workshop Evaluation 45

Appendix F Problem Solution Planning 52

Appendix G Systemmatic Planning 58

SECTION I

An Overview

INTRODUCTION

Problem Identification

One of the most significant areas of interest in American education today is that of desegregation. The United States Commission on Civil Rights cites the city of Buffalo as one of the most segregated school systems in the North. Furthermore, the school system is currently under orders from the New York State Commission on Education to alleviate the racial imbalance that exists. The system has developed several programs including bussing, redistricting, and magnet schools. To date, the bussing plan has effected the most children. Under this plan, children from five (5) core schools in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades are being transported to twenty-two (22) fringe area schools within the school system.

During a previous Institute on Unique Problems of Urban School Administration, funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, much interest was attuned to problems of desegregation in the Buffalo Public Schools. This Institute indicated varying degrees of success with present plans involving the "sending" and "receiving" schools. Since success correlated highly with the attitude toward desegregation held by the administrative leadership in the schools involved, another workshop was proposed to concentrate on that leadership.

By combining the joint efforts of the Buffalo Public School System and the State University of New York at Buffalo, a plan was devised to provide such an Institute. The purpose of the Institute is to initiate and evaluate action programs to facilitate the implementation of the School System's desegregation policies. Its specific objectives are:

1. To identify problems deriving from district-wide integration plans as they apply to the "sending" and "receiving" administrative units of the Buffalo Public Schools.

2. To plan action programs involving students, teachers, and parents which focus on the solution of problems incident to school desegregation.

3. To initiate creative programs invclving people from both school and community to enhance the success of district-wide desegregation policy.

4. To evaluate these action programs in order to assess their success and to make decisions regarding the continued maintenance of or the re-allocation of resources generated toward these programs.

Planning

The Institute was planned around the perceived needs of the administrative staff of the participating school districts. The continuous planning for daily (during the summer) and monthly workshops had constant input from the participants, trainers, special lecturers, graduate assistant, and the director.

During the early planning session, several problem areas were identified by the participants. The two most frequently mentioned problem areas were school-community relations and teachers and staffing. The most frequently occurring problems were:

1. Methods for instructing teachers ir handling problems incident to integration in the receiving schools.
2. Creating relaxed atmospheres for integration.
3. Encouraging parent cooperation in school activities.
4. Involving the community.
5. Evaluating different socio-economic children and communicating with parents.
6. Communication between the school and the Central Office.
7. Increasing the number of visitations to the school by Negro parents.
8. The orientation of children of both the sending and the receiving schools.
9. Discipline problems with bussed-in children.
10. How can students promote integration in the community?

Procedures

The Institute was divided into three parts: the first being a comprehensive two-week workshop for twenty participants in the summer of 1968; the second was a comprehensive four-day workshop held in November 1968 that was designed to familiarize new participants with the experiences of the summer workshop; and the third, monthly workshops designed to build upon the ideas of the comprehensive workshops and to move toward a working plan for each school.

The Summer Workshop - Part I

Two nationally known trainers were retained to bring their expertise on human relations and organizational planning to the Summer Institute. These trainers were:

Mr. Walter Plotch, National Education Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, New York City. Human relations consultant.

Dr. Higgins D. Bailey, Superintendent of Schools, Emeryville, California. Organizational design consultant.

Program

The typical Institute day was divided into a morning session from 9 A.M. to 12 noon, and the afternoon session from 1 P.M. to 3 P.M. Throughout the Institute period, July 8 to July 19, 1968, small and large group discussions were utilized: (1) to identify and analyze problems incident to school desegregation; and (2) to study designs to plan and evaluate action programs dealing with desegregation. A typical day would be as follows:

9:00 - 10:00 A.M.	Large group presentation on a significant topic
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee break - an opportunity for informal reflection and interaction concerning the large group presentation
10:30 - 12 noon	General session - a large group discussion of the morning topic with the trainer and participants responding to prepared questions and extemperaneous inquiries in order to further understand the topic.
12:00 - 1:00 P.M.	Lunch - an opportunity for more informal interaction
1:00 - 2:00	Small group discussion and interaction about the morning presentation with particular emphasis on analysis and application to the respective schools. Each group had a recorder that made a report to the large group. These groups remained intact throughout the week.
2:00 - 3:00	Return to large groups for small group reports which provided a basis for application to all schools. The small group analysis of the special problem areasproduced recommendations for the total group.

The Participants

The Institute program was presented in advance to the central administrative staff of the Buffalo Public School System. The Chief School Officer was encouraged to recommend

personnel who could benefit from the Institute, and who as a result of attendance would further serve the school district in a leadership role. Administrative personnel also could initiate an application through their central administrative office or through the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.

The Summer Institute participants were selected basically from the administrative staffs of the Buffalo Public School System; five principals from the Niagara Public Schools also attended. In addition to principals, the participants held the positions of: assistant principals, guidance counselors, classroom teachers, and central office personnel. Thus, the participants were local educational leaders who could collectively and individually contribute to the solution of urban desegregation problems. (See Appendix A for a list of summer participants).

Evaluation

The Summer Institute was evaluated independently by evaluators appointed by the University. The evaluation report and questionnaire are included in Appendices B and C.

The evaluation report indicates that the Institute met the needs of the participants; that their expectations had been fulfilled; and that they desired to continue the workshop. The over-all quality of the discussion topics was rated as good. The composite score of all ten daily summer sessions was B or B+. The composite score of the general aim and structure of the summer session was B+ to A-.

Suggestions for changing the format or content of the Institute included:

1. More individual identification of problem areas
2. More Negro participants
3. Student inputs
4. A library of reading materials

5. More resource people who have dealt with the problem of desegregation
6. Better preparation by the speakers
7. More small group meetings
8. More preliminary work on individual problem areas so groups could work together better
9. A longer Institute period
10. Developing individual programs
11. More parents involved

Where possible, the above listed suggestions were adopted in the subsequent monthly workshops and the two-day sessions in November.

The November Workshop - Part II

The two trainers that lead the summer workshop were engaged to work with new participants during the November workshop: Walter Plotch, assisted by two representatives of B'Nai B'Rith and Dr. Higgins Bailey assisted by Dr. James Conway from the Department of Educational Administration, State University of New York at Buffalo.

These workshop sessions followed the general format of the summer workshop and were held from 2 P.M. to 8 P.M. They provided an excellent opportunity for the new participants to work directly with the experienced trainers that had enriched the summer program.

Program

The first workshop was held on November 14 and 15 and focused on human relations. The second workshop was held on November 21 and 22 and focused on program planning. More elaborate information about those workshops will be found in Part II. Large and small group sessions with individual assistance were provided, especially during the human relations session.

The Participants

The summer participants were supplemented for this workshop by thirty of their colleagues from the administrative ranks of the Buffalo Public School System. The majority

of the additional participants were principals and vice principals from sending and receiving schools. See Appendix D for the total list of participants.

Again, the participants were encouraged by the Chief School Officers, their colleagues, and the University to attend the workshops.

Evaluation

See Appendix D and E.

The Monthly Workshops - Part III

The monthly workshops used special lecturers throughout their duration (September 1968 - June 1969) to add to the knowledge of the participants. Some of these were local Central Office administrators, Human Relations Board personnel, and administrators from neighboring cities in upstate New York. Perhaps the most notable was Dr. William Wayson, Principal, Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School, Syracuse, New York.

An elaboration of each monthly workshop appears in Part III of this report.

SECTION II

The Workshops In Detail

PART I

THE SUMMER WORKSHOP

The Summer Workshop

The Summer Workshop followed the format previously given and can be summarized in the following manner:

First Day: Welcome by Dr. Rollo Handy from the Faculty of Educational Studies

Introduction of trainers and of participants

Identification of specific problems from participants, some of which were:

1) Preparation of committee and staff

2) Definition of terms

3) How do I close the gap between the parents and the school?

The afternoon session of the first day was divided into small group discussion and large group reporting. Groups of seven or eight discussed possible problems that are in common, and possible approaches to their solution. The first few days were divided among large group and small group discussions. A case study, "Pickets At the Gates", formed a basis for discussion and analysis. This study revealed how a principal can be "out of touch" with the reality of his attendance area. From this case study the participants saw a need to more rigorously inspect themselves to see if they knew their school communities and perceived them in the proper perspective.

The participants also observed the film "Boy" obtained from B'Nai B'Rith. This film motivated discussions, especially as to description and analysis of individual feelings. The next day activity centered on a rumor clinic and identification of stereotypes. The first week ended with a day of role playing in which members depicted a conflict situation between a principal and parents.

The second week began with an organizational plan for improving the planning skills of the participants. This plan, presented by Dr. Higgins Bailey, basically is a four-step operation going from the conceptual to the concrete through very definite steps. See Appendix H.

Another role playing session concerning a problem of reading difficulty was portrayed and carefully described and analyzed. There also was another film, "A Study in Color", after which large and small group discussions were held concerning its implications.

During the middle of the second week, a visit by Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent of Schools in Buffalo, was effected. Dr. Manch enlightened the group with topics of discussion from recent meetings of integration workshops at Harvard and Columbia. After a short presentation, he answered questions from the participants pertaining to the local problems of school integration.

Near the end of the workshop, a panel of parents, a student, and a leader in the "black" community made presentations and answered questions pertaining to their particular desires and interpretation of the local school district desegregation policies.

The final day was devoted to discussion groups which focused on the panel questions and answers of the previous day.

Underlying themes for the workshop were that principals: develop skills in problem identification, become sensitive to desegregation problems, and provide leadership in getting their community more involved in their respective schools.

PART II

The November Workshops

The November Workshop

The November workshop consisted of two two-day workshops. These workshops provided an opportunity for the new participants to be immersed in a comprehensive and intensive learning activity under the direction of experienced trainers. The report from those four sessions follows.

Workshop A

Dates: November 14 & 15, 1968

Trainers: Mr. Walter Plotch, Education Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, New York City

Mr. Harold Schiff, Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, New York City

Mr. Peter Lewis, Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, Chicago, Illinois

Meeting Place: Norton Union, S.U.N.Y.A.B. Campus

Time: 2:00 to 8:00 P.M.

Objectives:

1. To develop skill in the identification and analysis of problems incident to public integration policy for school administrators and supportive personnel.

2. To plan, initiate, and evaluate action programs designed to provide solutions to problems involving student teachers, or parents in carrying out district desegregation policies.

3. To provide an opportunity for new participants in the workshop to experience learning situations similar to those gained in the summer 1968 workshop by their colleagues.

Participants: Principals, vice principals, guidance counselors and some teachers from Buffalo and Niagara Falls.

Thursday, November 14, 1968

The first session began with self-introductions and then moved to identification of pressing human relations problems. Some of the problems presented by the participants were: 1) Staff members (principals, vice-principals, and teachers) can't agree on methods for desegregation; 2) There are blocks to communication between blacks and whites (too many third person observations); 3) There seems to be a double standard of communication; 4) Decentralization of central control to community control; 5) Someone needed in the receiving school for bussed-in Negro children to identify with; 6) Teachers can not bring the students up to the grade level commensurate with their age; how and when to train teachers for this; 7) Necessity of central office approval for curriculum modifications.

After the identification of the problems, the large group broke up into three small groups for an analysis of a case study, "Pickets At the Gates". The groups first read and discussed "The Event", part one of the case study, which was followed by part two, "Relevant Factors". The discussion after reading part two changed considerably, and the consensus was that it is very necessary to get all of the relevant factors in a situation before making a decision. The discussion after part one had been much different in that the participants felt compassion and association with Mr. Fields. Although they felt that he was somewhat in the wrong, the group generally defended his actions. This entire exercise was dealt with very apprehensively by the participants as they seemed to be feeling-out the trainers and were reluctant to contribute. Often, they would not make concrete statements or attempt an analysis.

While the preceeding was occupying the new participants on the first day of the workshop, the other participants from the summer group were working on approaches to problems unique to their respective schools. They broke up into small groups and attempted to formulate plans of attack that would alleviate some of their problems. At the conclusion of the

day, all the participants got together for dinner, at which time much interaction took place concerning the day's activities. Following dinner each group held further discussions of the "Case".

Friday, November 15, 1968

This session began with a showing of the film "Boy". The large group was again broken up into small groups at which time the film was discussed and analyzed. The film depicts a man shining another man's shoes with a series of black and white mask changes between he and his customer. It portrays a vivid representation of racial prejudice and of one man's attempt to put down another. The discussion of the film generally centered around the idea that it was a good story but that it is not a reality today. This naive attitude on the part of the participants was alarming to the trainers, who felt that much work was needed in the field of human relations with this group.

Following the film, the group of new participants went to a role-playing session which depicted a principal, teacher, two sets of irate parents, and a city councilwoman. The problem arose when the teacher suspended students from class because of a disagreement between the students when he was not in the room. The situation mushroomed into a much larger political issue through the presence of the councilwoman. The discussion following the session generally centered around the idea that the principal should not have allowed the councilwoman to enter his office at all. It was felt that a solution could amicably be reached between the parties much more easily without the presence of politics.

While the new group was persuing these discussions, the other group was working on solutions to problems incident to their respective schools, one of which was presented during the second November workshop. (See Appendix F for an example of this type of planning).

After the dinner session, the group of new participants gathered for a short meeting in order to sum up the two-day workshop and to make a list of conclusions. These conclusions were as follows:

1) Don't jump to conclusions too quickly

2) Be sure to spend time on the relevant factors concerning your attendance area

3) Stop to examine thoughts and statements

4) Nothing has been learned if there is no change in behavior

5) There is a higher level of frustration when there is a division between administrators and the black community

6) How well is the group able to hear a threatening point of view?

7) There should be more and shorter sessions that enable participants to go home and discuss the proceedings

8) Do all black people feel alike?

9) There is a fear of raising "hot" issues that might kill the workshop

10) Can a group of white people solve the problems of the black community?

11) Lumping of bussed students is bad - drawing a we and they distinction

12) Need to involve the community

13) Need to examine the individual personality

14) Trainer's suggestion - Identify and visit with 3 key black leaders - get their feelings and listen

Workshop B

Dates:	November 21 & 22, 1968
Trainers:	Dr. Higgins D. Bailey, Superintendent of Schools Emeryville, California
	Dr. James Conway, Professor of Education, S.U.N.Y.A.B.
Meeting Place:	Norton Union, S.U.N.Y.A.B. Campus
Time:	2:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.

Thursday, November 21, 1968

The first session of the workshop opened with introductions of the new trainers - Higgins Bailey and James Conway. Immediately after the introductions Dr. Bailey presented an overview of the workshop which was to have as its goal the presentation of a model for planning "that works" in school districts.

A problem identification session followed (Appendix G) headed by Dr. Conway, which probed for school self-evaluation of planning skills. Following the identification of some thirty problems, a slide presentation "Planning for Educational Change" was observed by the participants in order to help them to develop a model for their own use.

After a short coffee break, "The Ballad of Shiftless Jones" was presented showing an application of a planning model. (See Appendix H) This planning model was then the focus of concentration for small group activities as they worked on their own models.

Basically, this model requires a four-step process that starts with the conceptual and goes to the concrete. In the first step is an assessment of what exists and the range of possibilities available. The second step is the establishment of a philosophy and the setting of priorities that follow the philosophy. The third step is to construct a model that examines the possible program, methods, and materials; that outlines the roles of various personnel; that sets up an administrative structure; and finally establishes performance objectives for each person and each function. The fourth step is the action plan which identifies the major issues to be completed in order to implement the program; that breaks down each mission into identifiable tasks; that estimates the personnel, time, facilities, and materials necessary to accomplish each task. This step also includes setting up a sequence of events specifying the order in which tasks are to be accomplished; that develops a tentative time schedule for task accomplishment; that calculates and adjusts for load and overload distribution to personnel involved; and finally that takes care of management tasks, time schedules, and work loads.

The first day's session ended with problem analysis by small groups that fed back to the large group and made recommendations for problems to be considered during the remainder of the workshop.

Friday, November 22, 1968

The second day of the workshop began with a statement from one of the participants saying that he had already established a planning wall in his office that would be used to build models and to attack problems. The session then moved to identification and clarification of a problem upon which to concentrate. Following this, the entire group moved into small groups in order to identify the situational factors that bear upon the identified problem. Then the large group assembled again to compile, compare, and contrast the important factors bearing on the problem. Moving along the four-step model, the small groups then reassembled to decide who, when, and how to gather information.

Following this step, the group broke for dinner and interaction and reflection upon the two days' activities, specifically as it related to building useful models in the participants' schools. After dinner, the total group met briefly to finalize ways of collecting data, and to synthesize the workshop and discuss future activities of the group. Finally, one of the trainers, Dr. Bailey, left everyone with an assignment to state a problem, develop a model through the proper steps that would lead to an action plan to help facilitate desegregation in their respective schools.

PART III

The Monthly Workshops

The September Workshop

Date:	September 26, 1968
Meeting Place:	Charter House, Williamsville, New York
Time:	2:00 - 8:00 P.M.
Objectives:	1. To define general problem areas of desegregation in the urban school. 2. To identify one problem area of concern that all participants can attack. 3. To define and clarify the legal responsibility of the principal in the urban school.
Participants:	Principals, vice principals, guidance counselors, and some teachers from Buffalo and Niagara Falls.

Proceedings

The session began with a large group discussion of general problems having to do with desegregation in the urban school. The discussion then focused on one area of common interest identified as the "noon-hour period". The workshop followed the format suggested by the steering committee which met late in August of 1968 to begin planning the year's activities.

The "noon-hour" discussion session identified several problem areas which were referred to small groups for possible solution.

Large group discussion - definition of problem areas

1. Responsibility of school for children eating away from school
   Lunchroom in the building, outside of the building, etc.
2. Length of lunch hour
3. Teacher contract
4. Use of aids

5. Equal treatment of all children

6. Facilities

7. Community reactions

8. Board policy - a greatly emphasized problem

9. Complaints of business people in the area

10. Segregating effects of restrictions

Small group discussions

Much of the group discussion emphasized teacher stipulation of policy and movement toward a change in the present board policy. There seemed to be quite a bit of negative thinking and quotations such as the following were common: "It would be impossible..."; "We can't change..."; "Our contract only permits..."; "In Buffalo the policy is..."; "They (the children) won't do it...". Very few times were the members reminded that they should "Get away from the idea - you can't". By far the greatest emphasis was upon a redefinition and spelling out of board policy.

Reports from the small groups

Groups which employed the brainstorming technique seemed to come up with more solutions than did other groups. Many times, further problems were added to the ones that supposedly were being solved.

Following the reports from the small groups, the participants returned to the large group for a presentation by Dr. J. Norman Hayes concerning the legal responsibility of the principal in the urban school.

The October Workshop

Date: October 31, 1968

Meeting Place: Norton Union, S.U.N.Y.A.B. Campus

Time: 2:00 - 7:00 P.M.

Objectives:

1. To apply brainstorming techniques to problem solving areas within the Institute and at specific schools

2. To identify human relations problem areas and afford participants the opportunity to discuss problems with Mr. Tom Penna from the Buffalo City Commission on Human Relations

Proceedings

The session began with a brainstorming lecture by U.S.A.F. Colonel Bert Decker. Following the presentation, a small demonstration was set up for observation. After the brainstorming session, Mr. Tom Penna spoke on human relations and related specifically to problems in the Buffalo Public Schools. Notes of both those discussions and the resulting role playing concerning human relations are on the following pages.

Colonel Bert Decker - Brainstorming

To begin his demonstration of brainstorming techniques, Colonel Decker established the objective of formulating devises to break habits which inhibit creative thinking and problem solving. By employing manipulative verbs such as reverse, adapt, enlarge, lengthen, etc. to common words and concepts, one can derive new innovative ideas which can open avenues to problem-solving and learning.

Colonel Decker listed the rules for successful brainstorming as:

1. Defer judgement
2. Hitch-hike - use manipulative verbs
3. Strive for quantity and remote associations over quality
4. List all ideas without reservation

If one states his problem in the form - "How might I... ?"; employs the rules for successful brainstorming; and avoids generalizations, creative thinking can be achieved.

Next, Colonel Decker introduced the OFPISA or feedback system. It consists of six systemmatic procedures in the creative process of problem-solving.

1. O bjective finding
2. F act finding
3. P roblem finding
4. I dea finding
5. S olution finding
6. A cceptance

In turn, four steps are applied to each phase of OFPISA:

1.. Generate statements on a deferred basis
2. Generate evaluative criteria
3. Select the most appropriate evaluative criteria
4. Apply evaluative criteria selections to select the best ideas

Colonel Decker ably demonstrated the need for creative questionning and the concentration which is necessary to clear one's mind of habits which retard the creative processes.

The next presentation was made by Mr. Tom Penna of the Buffalo Commission on Human Relations. He presented some of his own insights into the problem of desegregation. In school-community relations, the school must take the environment into account, but often there is a lack of communication even at this local level.

School departments are impersonal, hierarchical, authoritarian, bureaucracies. Seldom is there any rocking of the boat or feedback from local schools to the Administration. Many administrators seem to have the idea that if no one talks about a problem there is none; while they should be expecting problems to arise and be providing for staff feedback to help in their solution.

Many school administrators harbor self-fulfilling ideas which are harmful to black children. For example, it has been shown that achievement levels of pupils can be greatly affected by preconceived ideas of teachers and administrators. The double standard of discipline with regard to black children is another problem. Principals often avoid necessary punishment for fear of being accused of causing a "racial situation". Therefore, black children are allowed to get away with more, white children feel the unfairness of the situation,

and often the result is a complete disciplinary breakdown.

In the discussion of integration problems of one Buffalo school, the significant question was raised - "Did the problems really begin just when the black children began to be bussed in?" Full and natural integration where the black children are in the same situation as the whites is needed. Perhaps the talents of Negro students can be used to break down stereotypes. The subject of screening of children for bussing created a controversy among participants. Many felt that no one has a right to play god in such a situation and that screening may create a disproportionate picture of the Negro child and further reinforce stereotypes.

A role-playing situation gave participants an insight into the problems which administrators face in issues arising from the problems of desegregation. That terminology can effect psychological attitudes was clearly demonstrated, and participants were left with the question - What can the Administration, the Office of Integration, and the Commission on Human Relations do to ameliorate situations in which no party is satisfied?

The January Workshop

Date:	January 13, 1969
Meeting Place:	Treadway Inn - Niagara Falls, New York
Time:	2:00 - 7:00 P.M.
Objective:	To aid in correcting existing racial imbalance in the Beech Avenue School, Niagara Falls, New York
Activity:	Listening to a presentation of the problem, visiting the school, and discussing possible solutions in large and small groups
The Problem:	The Correction of Existing Racial Imbalance at the Beech Avenue School, Niagara Falls, New York

Description of the Problem

At present, one elementary school (Beech Ave.) in Niagara Falls is "racially imbalanced" in terms of the Administrative Guide Line issued from the New York Department of Education in 1962. The predominantly Negro school, located in the north end of the city, has an enrollment of 383 students of which 53 are white. The almost new and well appointed facility prevents its abandonment, and its location does not allow the flexibility for change found in many other neighborhood school districts.

The Beech Avenue School situation presently is being studied not only by the Board of Education but by the entire community. It is hoped that a solution that is educationally sound and practically workable will be reached. The desegregation of the school will occur as of September 1, 1969 as directed by a resolution of the Board of Education dated August 7, 1967.

Program

The problem of Beech Avenue School, background information, and the present situation were presented by representatives of the Niagara Falls Central Administration. The

Superintendent was called to Albany, New York and was unable to attend the workshop. The presentation was led by William Valentine and Murphy Pitaressi.

Following the large group presentation, the participants were divided into small discussion groups to explore possible solutions to the problem.

After a bus tour of Niagara Falls, New York to view the school situation and a visit to Beech Avenue School itself, the following topics were presented to and discussed by the total group with regard to the problem at Beech Avenue School:

1. Voluntary Transfer
2. Change of district boundaries
3. Two-way bussing for the total system
4. Open enrollment for the entire school district
5. Special v. regular school designation in the district
6. Possible use of the Princeton Plan to eliminate the problem
7. Closing of School 22 and making Beech Avenue School primary and Hyde Park an intermediate school. This plan would involve all economic areas
8. The need for State legislation
9. The need to sell the community by:
    a) Enlisting the newspapers
    b) Using parents
    c) Visual programs - T.V.
    d) Open House programs

Problems identified by the group with regard to Beech Avenue School were:

1. The problem of token bussing
2. Children are bussed in but really don't mix with the school population
3. Parents continue to favor the neighborhood school concept
4. 28% Negro population is needed at Beech Avenue School to meet the agreement
5. The need to move about 180 blacks and whites

Following the final report, a steering committee for the February 27th workshop was selected.

The February Workshop

Date: February 27, 1969

Meeting Place: Norton Union, S.U.N.Y.A.B. Campus

Time: 2:00 - 7:00 P.M.

Special Trainer: Dr. William W. Wayson, Principal
Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School, Syracuse, New York
On leave from the Educational Administration Dept. - Syracuse University

Objectives:

1. Attacking the Problem of an Urban School - The Staff and Program Development

2. Implications for successful school integration

3. The Campus School Concept - Emphasis on the Desireability to Integrate at an Early Age

Proceedings

This session followed the general format of large and small group discussion led by Dr. Wayson. He attempted to inspire the participants to meet problems head-on. Dr. Wayson has had considerable success in opening the climate of an urban school. This has been accomplished by his efforts to increase communication between students, parents, teachers, and administrators, and thus maximizing the effectiveness of an urban school.

Dr. Wayson began his discussion by listing what he called the Traditional Goals of the American School System:

1. To perpetuate the existing distribution of goods and power in a local area
2. To inculcate rural values
3. To make people conform
4. To supply the labor needs of local industry
5. To teach that blacks are inferior

These goals are perpetuating educational and desegregational problems and are causing the educational system to fail its children. Some signs of failure in an educational system were

identified as:

1. Failure to meet the obligation to educate every child
2. Failure to meet its singular charge of teaching literacy
3. Failure to diagnose why a child is not learning and find a cure
4. Failure to change the traditional functional goals of the school
   The modern emphasis is on creativity, divergent thinking, and problem solving
5. Failure to provide equality of opportunity
   One participant commented that "Middle class children will learn even if the schools close".

The total group was then divided into five small groups to discuss and list "things" which they see that are perpetuating the traditional goals of the American School System and which are barriers to needed changes.

Group 1 - Guidance counselors who push students into professions which they think are best; outside control of funds; selective recruitment by colleges; separate suburban and trade schools; tuition for college; exams for promotion

Group 2 - Sanctity of the home and "the family"; success through hard work myth; school year; textbooks and stories

Group 3 - Seating; marking; standard tests; punishment; dress; bells; planbooks; "accepting children with parents"; one curriculum

Group 4 - Vocational courses; career days; report cards; grade levels; training for nonexistant jobs

Group 5 - Sins of ommission; stereotypes; segregation; special week of traditional black culture; distribution of supplies; lack of multi-ethnic texts; attitudes we hold

Dr. Wayson himself mentioned several forces which implement the dysfunctional goals of the educational system:

1. The lack of written disciplinary policies which can implement prediction
2. Specialization and the resulting inability to think outside of one's area - "trained incapacity"
3. Treating deviation as a threat
4. Valuing rules over goals - resistance to change and myth perpetuation
5. Shields: certification, licenses, tenure
6. Reliance on "divine right authority" which causes children to try brinkmanship
7. Fear of rebellion and the pushing upward of authority
8. Advancement only if one plays the games of the system
9. "Specialization in mediocrity" - nonresponsible teachers

Dr. Wayson mentioned militant teachers, militant parents, and militant high school students as the bases of power and the most powerful change agents in the educational system.

To conclude his presentation, Dr. Wayson left the workshop participants with some possible suggestions which he has found to be of value in his efforts to improve the educational system:

1. Admit failure and the need to improve without rationalizing
2. Make a new curriculum and change the system where necessary
3. Home visits
4. Open the school to the public at all times
5. Form a cabinet of responsible teachers to concentrate on methods of improvement

Budget Changes and Alternatives

It was necessary to obtain more funds for consultant services than were originally intended. One co-ordinator could not participate in the study. By transferring the amount of the co-director's compensation, the funds were available for additional consultant services. Also, a smaller amount was transferred from Other (42) to Supplies (40) to facilitate clerical duties.

Budget Transfers on Grant #50-1203-A

$4600.00	Transferred from Payroll (03) to Personal Service (01) - Consultant fees being paid through purchase orders against the Consultant Service category of Personal Service instead of through the payroll as provided for in the original budget.
$600.00	Transferred from Other (42) to Supplies (40)

Alternative Uses of Budget Surplus

The summer workshop involved only 20 participants. The Institute previously had budgeted for 50 participants. Therefore, it is anticipated that there will be unused stipend funds. Such funds should be directed toward future activity and programs for the Institute participants, for example:

1. A week-long simulation workshop using materials developed by the University Council of Educational Administration could be held. Such a workshop would improve the administrative and human relation skills of the administrators of the sending and receiving schools of the Buffalo Public Schools.

2. The Institute could be extended and refunded for the school year 1969-70. There still exists a component of administrators of sending and receiving schools who are not participating in the present workshop. Future workshops could include 35 school administrators and 15 central office personnel who are directly involved in the Buffalo integration program.

3. Rotating workshops could be organized to increase total building staff understanding of the problems of integration. Several school staffs could be selected for such workshops with release time provided by the school system. Such workshops could be designed similarly to those provided this last year, incorporating the most successful activities and adding others.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS

Kathleen Anglim
Assistant Principal
#74 School

*Mr. Frank E. Benbenek
Assistant Principal
#79 School

Mrs. Janice Bracken
Communications Specialist
Buffalo Bd. of Education

Miss Helen K. Burns
Principal
#12 School

Mr. Eugene Craig
Principal
#59 School

Miss Concetta D'Amico
Guidance Counselor
Clinton Junior High

Mr. David Doherty
Principal
#42 School

Mr. Kenneth Franklin
Principal
#22 School

Mr. Donald Gardner
Graduate Assistant for
Dr. Troy V. McKelvey

* Yvonne Glover
Teacher
#27 School

* Mrs. Jeanette B. Gorman
Assistant Principal
#19 School

Mr. Thomas Hobart
Guidance Counselor
#81 School

Miss Alice Krenning
Principal
#64 School

Mr. Donald S. Laing
Director, Office of Integration
Buffalo Bd. of Education

Miss Margaret M. Malone
Principal
#43 School

Dr. Jeanne Mart
Teacher
#60 School

Dr. Troy V. McKelvey
Assistant Professor and
Institute Director

Mr. Bertram Miller
Principal
#52 School

Mr. Elmer N. Miller
Principal
#51 School

* Miss A. Jeanette Nappa
Principal
#78 School

Miss Irene Navagh
Principal
#23 School

Mr. Michael C. O'Laughlin
Principal
North Junior High School

Grace Patterson
Helping Teacher
#44 School

* Mr. Murphy Pitarresi
Vice Principal
Gaskill Jr. High School

*Mrs. Victoria Polley
Principal
39th Street Elem. School

Miss Zella Ruslander
Principal
#19 School

* Serena Marie Sanfilipio
Teacher

Mr. Dellzon Stokes
Principal
#74 School

* Mr. William Valentine
Principal
93rd Street Elem. School

Miss Evelyn K. Ward
Principal
#68 School

Mr. Gillis Watson
Assistant Principal
#59 School

Miss Kathryn Williams
Principal
Cleveland Ave. Elem.

Ruth Williams
Principal
#56 School

Mary Neylon
Principal
#65 School

* Indicates Summer 1968 Participants

ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Charles W. Baumler
Principal
#82 School

Miss Ida Brock
Principal
#47 School

Bertram G. Chalmer
Principal
#31 School

Heloise M. Cohen
Principal
#62 School

Milton J. Conomos
Teacher
Seneca Vocational High

Salvatore D. Criscione
Assistant Principal
#47 School

Mary E. Dickey
Assistant Principal
#68 School

Kenneth J. Echols
Assistant Director
Office of Integration

Barbara Green
Assistant Principal
#69 School

Esther M. Hoeldtke
Principal
#60 School

Robert J. McDonnell
Helping Teacher
#69 School

C. Ross Monteleone
Assistant Principal
#53 School

Ophelia Nichols
Assistant Principal
Fillmore Middle School

Melody L. Reynolds
Guidance Counselor
#68 & #56 Schools

Frank J. Rizzo
Assistant Principal
#54 School

Herman Rodenberg
Assistant Principal
#69 School

Rebecca Shepard
Principal
#3 School

Marjory J. Sullivan
Principal
#71 School

Mary Wild
Assistant Principal
#43 School

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION

At the conclusion of the Institute, all 20 attendants were asked to complete a three-page questionnaire (Appendix A) and to return it by mail, unsigned. The questionnaire was divided into five parts and included a number of questions designed to help assess the overall success of the Institute.

On Part I of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about the enrollment of their respective schools. A compilation of these data is presented in Table 1, below, although it must be recognized that these data probably represent only close approximations to the actual data.

TABLE 1. EXPERIENCE AND ENROLLMENT DATA DESCRIBING PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

	Smallest One-third	Middle One-third	Largest One-third	Average (Median)
Size of school	350 - 450	550 - 800	1100-1400	775
Percent of black students	1 - 5%	7 - 20%	25-99%	10%
Percent of black students bussed in	None	8 - 80%	91-100%	71%
Years of experience (administration plus teaching)	2 - 18	20 - 23	36-45	21
Years of experience in integrated school	0 - 4	4 - 20	20-26	17
Years of sending or receiving	None	1 - 3	3-20	1

As shown in Table 1, two-thirds of those attending the Institute were from schools having a pupil enrollment of 800 or less. Fewer than one-third of the participants were from predominantly black school. In fact, two-

thirds of the schools represented has less than 25 percent black students, and less than 9 percent Negro faculty. As might be expected, a high percentage of the black students are bussed in (ave. 71%).

Half of those attending the Institute had at least 21 years of experience in administration and teaching, combined, with 17 of those years being spent in an integrated school, on the average.

Part II of the questionnaire asked the participants whether or not they were satisfied with the facilities provided by the University and the Institute. These data are summarized in Table II, below:

TABLE 2. SATISFACTION WITH INSTITUTE-UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Facility	Percent Satisfied	Percent Not Satisfied
1. Main lounge	94%	6%
2. Lounges (small group)	94%	6%
3. Parking	100%	0
4. Time of daily meetings	100%	0
5. Registration facilities	100%	0
6. Coffee breaks 1	88%	12%
7. Lunch	56%	44%
8. General organization .	94%	6%

With the possible exception of lunch, all of the facilities were rated as generally satisfactory. Lunch was considered unsatisfactory by 44% of the participants, many of whom probably also were dissatisfied with the coffee breaks.

On Part III of the questionnaire, participants were asked to evaluate various aspects of the Institute program, using the familiar 5-point letter scale, A through E. The letters were defined as follows:

A - very good
B - good
C - mediocre
D - poor
E - very poor

The first half of Part II concerned the success of the ten daily discussion sessions, along four separate dimensions: (1) objectives clearly stated, (2) interesting, (3) opinions clearly and freely given, and (4) feedback was adequate. A brief summarization of these results is contained in Table 3, below:

TABLE 3. AVERAGE RATINGS OF TEN DAILY SESSIONS

	Objective Clear	Inter-esting	Opinions Clear	Feedback	Overall Ave.
1. Existing problem	B+	B	B	B	B
2. Case study	B+	A-	A-	B+	A-
3. "Boy"	B+	B	B	B	B
4. "Murphy" role play	A	A	A	A	A
5. Four-step planning	A	A	B	B	B+
6. Rumor clinic	A-	A-	B	A-	A-
7. Role play of reading problem	B	A-	A-	B	B+
8. A study in color	B	B	B	B	B
9. Dr. Manch	B	B-	C-	C-	C
10. Panel of parents	B-	B-	B	B	B-
Overall	B+	B+	B	B	B or B+

The letter ratings presented in Table 3 represent merely the median or average values without any regard for the degree of dispersion or inter-rater agreement. Considering the small sample size and the overall intent of the evaluation, a more elaborate treatment of the data was judged inadvisable, at this time.

From an inspection of Table 3, it can be seen that nine of the 10 sessions received an average rating of B (good) or better. The one

session that received the highest overall rating was the "Murphy" role playing session (#4).

It is also clear that the participants generally regarded the sessions as having clearly stated objectives, being interesting, inviting opinions and offering adequate feedback.

The second half of Part III comprised ten questions converning the general strudture and objectives of the Institute. Respondents were asked to use the same A to E letter scale to express their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These results are presented in Table 4, below:

TABLE 4. GENERAL AIMS AND STRUCTURE OF THE INSTITUTE

		Average Rating
1.	How well did the Institute achieve its objective to assist you in your ability to identify and analyze problems?	B+
2.	How well did the Institute achieve its objective to assist you in planning projects directed toward the solution of problems?	B
3..	How effective were the small group leaders in their discussions?	A-
4.	How effective were the trainers in reaching the two main objectives?	
	(a) Walter Plotch - Problem identification, analysis	A
	Developing programs	B
	(b) Higgins Bailey - Problem identification, analysis	A
	Developing programs	A
5.	To what extent did the Institute meet your expectations?	B
6.	How stimulating and informative was the over-all institute?	A-
7.	How beneficial was the interaction with co-workers from your school system?	B+

TABLE 4. Continued

	Average Rating
8. How beneficial was the interaction with co-workers from other school systems?	B+
9. How beneficial was your personal interaction with the Institute staff?	A-
10. How effective was the overall- Institute formal and organization?	A-

Once again, the combined ratings indicate a generally high degree of satisfaction with the Institute. Most of the average ratings were either A or A-, with the remainder being B's.

The concluding part (IV) of the questionnaire invited the respondent to express his opinion on four questions which might reveal salient weaknesses in the Institute, not reflected in the ratings. While information of this type cannot easily be transformed into tabular form, owing to the uniqueness of each response, it will provide aid in preparing for future Institutes with similar objectives.

APPENDIX D

Institute on Problems Incident to Urban School Desegregation
State University of New York at Buffalo
November 14, 15, 21, 22, 1968
Evaluation of November Workshops

This information will not be used for purposes of identification. Do not write your name on this evaluation sheet.

I. Please indicate the following:

1) What is the approximate size of the school you are with? (e.g. 500 pupils) Pupils_____

2) What percent of your school enrollment is black? _____

3) What percent (of 2 above) are bussed in? _____

4) What percent of the faculty on your staff is black? _____

5) How many years of experience as an administrator, or teacher, or both do you have? _____

6) How many years have you taught or administered in an integrated school? _____

7) How many years have you been in a school for either sending or receiving children? _____

II. Did you find the facilities of the Institute satisfactory? Please check(✓) Yes or No.

1) Norton Rooms Yes____No____

2) Parking Facilities Yes____No____

3) Time of daily meetings Yes____No____

4) Registration Facilities Yes____No____

5) Coffee Breaks Yes____No____

6) Dinners Yes____No____

7) General Organization Yes____No____

8) _____ Yes____No____
(other)

III. Please rate the sessions which you attended in each of the first four columns. Use the following rating scale:

A=very good
B=good
C=mediocre
D=poor
E=very poor

	Objective clearly stated	Interesting	Opinions clearly and freely given	Feedback was adequate
1. Existing problems				
2. Case study (Mr. Fields)				
3. Role-play (Fields)				
4. "Boy"				
5. Bailey's slide presentation				
6. "The Ballad of Shiftless Jones"				
7. Problem solving technique				

Using the same A to E scale, please assess the following aspects of the total Institute program: Rating

1. How well did the Insittute achieve its objective to assist you in your ability to identify and analyze problems? _____

2. How well did the Institute achieve its objective to assist you in planning projects directed toward the solution of problems? _____

3. How effective were the small group leaders in their discussions? _____

4. How effective were the trainers in reaching the two main objectives?
   a) Walter Plotch team
      1) Problem identification and analysis _____
      2) Greater understanding of black children _____
   b) Higgins Bailey team
      1) Problem identification and analysis _____
      2) Greater understanding of black children, _____

5. To what extent did the Institute meet your expectations? _____

6. How stimulating and informative was the over-all Institute? _____

7. How effective was the fraternization with co-workers from your school system? _____

8. How effective was the fraternization with co-workers from other school systems? _____

9. How effective was fraternization with the Institute staff? _____

10. How effective was the over-all Institute format and organization? _____

IV. Please fill in the following. If you need more space use the back of this page.

1. What were you hoping to gain from attending the Institute?

2. In what way was the Institute limited in meeting your expectations?

3. Would you attend another Institute similar in content and format to this one?
   Yes_____No_____

4. In what way would you change the format or content of the Institute if you were asked to plan another such Institute?

5. What specific value do you feel that you gained from the Institute? Indicate briefly.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Please return to Dr. Howard Kight in the
enclosed addressed envelope.

APPENDIX E

NOVEMBER WORKSHOPS EVALUATION

Howard Kight
Associate Professor of Educational Psychology
State University of New York at Buffalo

In an effort to help judge the degree of satisfaction and the success of the Workshop, all persons who attended and participated in the activities were asked to complete a brief questionnaire. This questionnaire originally was developed by Professors McKelvey and Kight (SUNY-Buffalo) and subsequently modified for use with a similar Workshop held during the previous summer.

As can be seen from an examination of the questions contained in the Questionnaire, all except those in Part I required an evaluative response, covering all phases and aspects of the Workshop. In Parts II and III, for example, respondents were asked to judge the effectiveness of the facilities and the Workshop sessions. In Part IV, the questions were designed to elici. comments and opinions, rather than a scaled response. For obvious reasons, the respondents were asked not to sign their names when returning their questionnaires.

Unlike the other three parts, Part I of the questionnaire was simply a series of seven questions designed to gather some general information about the participants and the schools they represented. A summarization of the data reported in Part I is presented in Table I, below:

Inasmuch as the sample size was comparatively small and produced wide fluctuations in Part I, it was deemed inappropriate to report any precise estimate of means and standard deviations. Rather, it was decided to summarize the data into three broad categories - the highest, middle, and lowest one third of responses for each of the seven questions. The size of the middle one third was allowed to vary $\pm$ 1 from each of the two extreme groups in order to adjust for the problem of dividing 29 Ss equally, or missing responses.

TABLE 1. EXPERIENCE AND ENROLLMENT DATA DESCRIBING PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

Questions (Part I)	Lowest 1/3	Middle 1/3	Highest 1/3
1. Size of school	400-700	725-1000	1,000-1,200
2. Percent of black students	1-10	14-29	30-99.5
3. Percent of black students bussed in	0	2-50	70-100
4. Percent of faculty black	0-4	4-5	8-50
5. Years of experience (admin. + teaching)	6-18	19-24	25-45
6. Years of experience in in integrated school	0-4	4-11	16-25
7. Years in school for sending or receiving children	0-1	1-4	4-22

As revealed by Table 1, one third of those attending the Workshop were from schools having a pupil enrollment between 1,000 and 1,200. A corresponding number of participants were from schools having a pupil enrollment of 700 or less.

In response to question 2, one third of the 29 respondents indicated that their enrollment figures reflected a ratio of at least 30% black students. Seven of these have percentages in excess of 96, out of which four were schools of 1000 or more students.

The percentage of black students bussed in varied from zero to 100%, with 18 out of 29 reporting a figure of 13 percent or less. Twelve of these 18 schools had enrollments under 1,000.

Approximately two thirds of the participants reported that less than eight percent of their faculty were black. This figure naturally corresponded with the percentage of black students reported in question 2. For example, 60 percent of the schools having eight percent or more of their faculty black also had more than 29 percent of their students which were black.

In looking at the years of combined administrative and teaching experience of the participants, it was found that one third had spent more than 24 years in this capacity. Sixty percent of these individuals had also spent 16 or more years in an integrated school. On the other hand, fifty percent of the respondents reported that they had spent fewer than nine years in an integrated school. Similarly, most of the participants reported that they had spent fewer than four years in a school for either sending or receiving children.

Part II of the questionnaire asked the participants whether or not they were satisfied with the facilities provided by the University and the Institute. These data are summarized in Table 2, below.

TABLE 2. SATISFACTION WITH INSTITUTE-UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Question: Facilities	Percent Satisfied	Percent Not Satisfied
1. Norton meeting rooms	100	0
2. Parking facilities	69	31
3. Time of scheduled meetings	57	43
4. Registration facilities	93	7
5. Coffee breaks	100	0
6. Dinners	62	38
7. General organization	93	7

Although most of the participants were satisfied with all of the facilites and arrangements concerning the Workshop, there were notable exceptions. The scheduled time of the meetings was unsatisfactory for many of the participants (43%) and may partially account for some of the difficulties encountered in parking. Some additional dissatisfaction was expressed toward the dinners, although it was clear that not all of the complaints were directed at the menu. Some participants indicated that they would prefer to have dinner with their family.

In Part III of the questionnaire, participants were asked to evaluate various aspects of the Workshop program, using a conventional 5-point letter scale, A through E, to reflect their degree of satisfaction. The scale was presented as follows:

A - very good C - mediocre E - very poor

B - good D - poor

The first half of Part III identified each of the seven discussion topics and respondents were asked to "rate" each topic on four separate criteria, using the above scale. The median responses are reported in Table 3, below.

TABLE 3. AVERAGE RATINGS OF THE SEVEN SESSIONS

	Opinions Clearly Stated	Interesting	Opinions Clearly & Freely Given	Adequate Feedback
1. Existing problem	B	B	C+	C
2. Case study (Mr. Fields)	B	A	B	B
3. Role-play (Mr. Fields)	B	A	B	B
4. "Boy"	B	A-	B	B
5. Bailey's slide presentation	B	B	B	B
6. "The Ballad of Shiftless Jones"	B	B	B	B-
7. Problem solving technique	B	B	B	B

From an inspection of Table 3, it can be seen that the sessions were generally regarded as "good" along all dimensions. Only in the first session, in a discussion of the existing problem, was the consensus less than "good" for any of the four criteria. The participants apparently felt that the opinions expressed during the first session either lacked some clarity or failed to allow sufficient freedom and interchange of ideas.

The second and third sessions, involving the Mr. Fields Case, as well as the fourth session ("Boy" - film), seemed to be the three most interesting sessions and were rated "A" by most of the participants.

The second half of Part III comprised 10 questions concerning the general structure and objectives of the Workshop. Respondents were asked to use the same A to E scale to express their degree of satisfaction. The median ratings are presented in Table 4, below.

TABLE 4. GENERAL AIMS AND STRUCTURE OF THE WORKSHOP

	Median Rating
1. How well did the Institute achieve its objective to assist you in your ability to identify and analyze problems.	B
2. Assistance in planning projects directed toward the solution of problems.	B
3. Effectiveness of small group leaders	B
4. Effectiveness of trainers:	
a. Problem identification and analysis	B
b. Greater understanding of black children	C+
5. To what extent did the Institute meet your expectations?	B
6. How stimulating and informative was the Institute?	B
7. How effective was the fraternization with co-workers from your school system?	B+
8. How effective was the fraternization with co-workers from other school systems?	A
9. How effective was fraternization with the Institute staff?	B
10. Effectiveness of Institute format and organization?	B

On nine of the 10 statements reported in Table 4, average ratings were B or higher. Considering the fact that these statements were intended to tap many of the important aims and outcomes of the Workshop, such favorable ratings as these seem encouraging. The two highest median ratings of B+ and A stemmed from the many opportunities provided by the Workshop to fraternize with co-workers inside and outside one's own school system. This undoubtedly resulted in many informal discussions of key problems and a vital means of information exchange.

In Part IV of the questionnaire, four of the five questions were designed to elicit comments and criticisms about the Workshop and how it might be improved. Question 3 was totally different in that it merely asked the participant whether or not he would attend another Workshop similar to this one. On this particular question, 75 percent of the 28 replies indicated that they would like to attend a second Workshop. Three were uncertain, one of whom expressed the hope that a more equal representation of black participants be present at the next Workshop.

Only four participants said that they definitely would not attend a similar Workshop. Two of these four individuals voiced desappointment that more attention was not given to the solution of specific problems. No mention was made, however, of what these problems should entail. Yet, it may be of some importance to note that both opinions were from administrators having the two highest percentages of bussed-in black pupils (100%).

Since the other four questions contained in Part IV resulted in a wide variety of comments and responses, it was not possible to provide any tabular summary of this information. Instead, it was decided to report only the most frequently occurring comments and responses. In this regard, it should be pointed out that Questions 4 and 5 yielded very little information beyond what was reported in Question 1 and 2, as evidenced by the similar nature of the questions. Thus, only those responses which occurred most frequently with Questions 1

and 2 are reported below:

Q. 1 -- What were you hoping to gain from attending the Institute?

ANS. (a) Understanding of black students and the problems of integration.

(b) Improving school-parent-community relationships.

(c) Insight into the problems of a receiving school.

Q. 2 -- In what way was the Institute limited in meeting your expectations?

(a) Providing greater opportunities to discuss specific, local problems in depth (i.e., small group sessions).

(b) More participation from those attending, including more black participants and more teachers.

(c) Shorter and more frequent sessions.

These comments, combined with the data gathered from the previous three sections of the Questionnaire, should prove extremely helpful in the planning and development of similar Workshops involving local school personnel.